



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MN

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,466	01/26/2005	Alan J. Terry	GB 020121	8056

24737 7590 05/16/2007

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

DU, THUAN N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2116

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/16/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/522,466

Applicant(s)

TERRY, ALAN J.

Examiner

Thuan N. Du

Art Unit

2116

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3 and 6-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 4 and 5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/7/05.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

Specification

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Claim Objections

2. Claims 6-22 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 6-22 have not been further treated on the merits.

To expedite a complete examination of the instant application, the claims objected above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending these claims to place them within the proper dependency. Examiner treats claims 6-9, 11 and 12 depend on claim 1, claims 18-20 depend on claim 15, claim 21 depends on claim 18, and claim 22 depends on claim 12.

3. Claims 6, 8 and 9 are objected because the following informality: it is not clear that “a mode” recited in the claims is the same or different from “a first mode” recited in claim 1.

Claim 7 is objected because the following informality: it is not clear that “an event” recited in the claim is the same or different from “a first event” recited in claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 12-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 12-17 use the phrase “operable to” which constitutes a use limitation and thus renders the claims indefinite as to what structure is embraced by the metes and bounds of the claim language. See MPEP § 2111.04.

Claims 18-22 are also rejected for incorporating the above deficiency by dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claim 22, since a computer readable storage medium encoded with the software has not been claimed, the software as claimed is computer listing per se (see MPEP 2106). Therefore, the claimed software does not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the software and other claimed elements of a computer which permits the software’s functionality to be realized.

To expedite a complete examination of the instant application, the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (non-statutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending these claims to place them within the four statutory categories on invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2116

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andersson et al. [Andersson], U.S. Patent No. 5,144,948.

10. Regarding claim 1, Andersson teaches a method comprising the steps of:

commencing a first mode (operation mode when the charge is completed) of the timing unit (pulse generator 10) [col. 2, lines 1-3];

detecting a first event (delivering pulse), which first event occurs after the commencement of the first mode, the first event being caused by the timing unit (pulse is delivered by the pulse generator 10) [col. 2, lines 1-4];

calculating a first time interval between the commencement of the first mode and the first event [col. 2, lines 16-23, 44-52]; and

performing a first comparison between the calculated first time interval and a first reference time interval [col. 2, lines 23-24, 53-54];

Andersson does not explicitly teach that configuration data is determined in dependence on the result of the first comparison. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Andersson for obtaining configuration data because it would increase the reliability of the system by precisely retrieving the configuration data.

11. Regarding claims 3 and 10, Andersson teaches counting time periods [col. 2, lines 16-17].

Art Unit: 2116

12. Regarding claim 6, Andersson teaches that the mode is commenced in response to a voltage applied to the system [col. 2, lines 1-2].

13. Regarding claims 7-9, these claims are directed to method steps for obtaining configuration data of claim 1. As stated above, Andersson teaches the invention substantially as set forth in claim 1. At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that Andersson may obviously also teach the method steps of claim 1 as set forth in claims 7-9. As such, claims 7-9 are rejected under the same rationale with respect to claim 1.

14. Regarding claim 11, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that Andersson would obviously use timestamp in order to measure the time interval.

15. Regarding claims 12-22, Andersson teaches the claimed method steps. Therefore, Andersson would obviously teach the apparatus to implement the claimed method steps.

Allowable Subject Matter

16. Claims 2, 4 and 5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuan N. Du whose telephone number is (571) 272-3673. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM, EST.

Art Unit: 2116

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rehana Perveen can be reached at (571) 272-3676.

Central TC telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

The fax number for the organization is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

TD
May 10, 2007



THUAN N. DU
PRIMARY EXAMINER